

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

By this amendment, claims 1-20 are pending, claims 5-7, 9, 12, 13, 16, 18 and 19 having been amended. Claims 5-7, 9, 12, 13 and 19 were amended only to improve form. Applicants submit that the amendments to claims 5-7, 9, 12, 13, and 19 neither broaden nor narrow the scope of the claims. Applicants amended claim 16 to broaden the scope of the claim. Applicants amended claim 18 to correct an error in the wording of the claim.

Rejection of Claims 1-20

On page 2 of the non-Final Office Action of December 2, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by published U.S. Patent Application 2002/0131404 to Mehta et al. ("Mehta"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a method in an electronic device having installed software therein for accessing a proxy server. The method includes, among other things, preventing a user from accessing web clipping applications that are installed on said electronic device and located within said installed software. On page 3 of non-Final Office Action of December 2, 2005, the Examiner alleged that Mehta, at page 2, paragraph 0013, discloses this feature. Applicants disagree.

Analyzing the wording of the claim, one would understand that the electronic device is separate from the proxy server because the electronic device has installed software therein for accessing the proxy server, which, of course, would be unnecessary if the electronic device was the proxy server. Further, according to claim 1, the web clipping applications are located within the installed software on the electronic device and the user is prevented from accessing the web clipping applications.

Mehta discloses a system and method for maintaining and distributing wireless applications (see title and abstract). Mehta, at page 2, paragraph 0013, discloses:

In another embodiment, the MAS supports a variety of security policies and mechanisms. Application filters can be created and managed that are used during the inspection process. In some embodiments, these filters are used to inspect code during submission and during provisioning. In yet another embodiment, a list of banned applications is provided that prevents subscribers from downloading content that has been dynamically banned by a carrier. In some embodiments this list is used during verification process. In yet other embodiments, security code is incorporated at various levels of the MAS to provide secure communication mechanisms, such as encryption, secure messaging, etc.

Thus, Mehta discloses a Mobile Application System (MAS) that may include application filters to inspect code when submitted and during provisioning. In another embodiment, a list of banned applications may be used to prevent a subscriber from downloading the banned applications.

According to page 1, paragraph 0005 of Mehta, the MAS is a collection of interoperating server components that work separately and together to provide applications and content to mobile subscriber devices. Applications, resources, and content may be provisioned and verified by the MAS for authorized access by the subscriber. Thus, the MAS may be used to download applications, resources, and content to electronic devices, such as, for example, wireless devices.

Applicants submit that the MAS of Mehta corresponds to a proxy server. Thus, Mehta discloses that applications, resources, and content may be downloaded from a proxy server to an electronic device, which in Mehta is a mobile subscriber device. Mehta further discloses that filters or lists may be used to prevent certain content, resources, or applications from being downloaded from the MAS to an electronic device, such as a mobile subscriber device. However, Mehta fails to disclose or suggest that the web clipping applications are installed on the electronic device in the installed software or that the user is prevented from accessing web

clipping applications in the installed software on the electronic device. Therefore, Mehta fails to disclose or suggest preventing a user from accessing web clipping applications that are installed on an electronic device and located within installed software, as required by claim 1.

Because Mehta fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 1, Applicants submit that claim 1 is not anticipated by Mehta and respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 and are not anticipated by Mehta for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claim 1. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2-8 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 9 is directed to a method for secure access of a proxy server by a portable information device (PID), wherein recurring device identification is eliminated. The method includes, among other things, loading a software package onto the PID wherein the software package includes a registration application and multiple hidden web clipping applications.

Mehta is completely silent regarding any disclosure or suggestion of loading a software package that includes multiple hidden web clipping applications to a PID. Therefore, Mehta does not anticipate independent claim 1. Further, nowhere in the Office Action does the Examiner allege that Mehta discloses or suggests loading a software package that includes multiple hidden web clipping applications to a PID. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 9 be withdrawn.

Claims 10-14 depend from claim 9 and are not anticipated by Mehta for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claim 9. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 10-14 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 15 is directed to a system. The system includes a proxy server coupled to the Internet, and an electronic device. The electronic device includes a processor coupled to a bus and a memory coupled to the bus. The memory has installed software for accessing the proxy server and instructions for implementing a method. The method includes, among other things, preventing a user from accessing web clipping applications that are installed on the electronic device and located within the installed software.

Applicants submit that claim 15 is similar to claim 1 and is not anticipated by Mehta for reasons similar to those provided with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 15 be withdrawn.

Claims 16-20 depend from claim 15 and are not anticipated for at least the reasons provided with respect to claim 15. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 16-20 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Having addressed all rejections, Applicants respectfully submit that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 22, 2006

Correspondence Address:
Customer No. 49637

By: 

Richard C. Irving
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 38,499
Phone: 410-414-3056
Fax No.: 410-510-1433